

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable  
5 reconsideration and allowance of the present application are hereby respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic interview granted on 23 March 2006 to Applicant. The substance of the interview is included in the Interview Summary.

10 In the interview, claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 26 – 28 and 51 and the references of Lee et al and Chraplyvy et al were discussed. Applicant agreed to incorporate the limitation of claim 3 into claim 1 to establish a clearer bit rate determination step for relating the two routing clauses, and agreed to incorporate a similar limitation into claim 26. The Examiner agreed this would overcome the current rejections of these  
15 claims. The Examiner also agreed claims 7 and 27 already show sufficient bit rate determination for relating the switching limitations and agreed to withdraw the rejection. The Examiner agreed to withdraw the rejection of claims 9 and 28 based on Applicant's argument that the combination does not show the claimed arranging. The Examiner agreed to withdraw the rejection of claim 51 as the combination does  
20 not show 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> switches for switching different bit rates where both switches are operatively associated with the same destination.

Claims 1 – 11, 26 – 28, and 34 – 52 were examined. Claim 3 has been canceled. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4 – 11, 26 – 28, and 34 – 52 are now pending in the application.

25 Claims 1 – 11, 26 – 28, 34 – 38, 41 – 47 and 49 – 52 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,288,808 to Lee et al (“Lee”) in view of published US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0156841 of Chraplyvy et al (“Chraplyvy”).

Claims 39, 40 and 48 are objected to as being dependent upon a  
30 rejected base claim.

Lee describes an optical asynchronous transfer mode ATM switch for

recovering the limitation of processing capacity and performing large capacity of switching.

Chraplyvy describes an optical transmission system which exploits the reduced signal-to-noise (SNR) requirements for low-bit rate channels to devise a new wavelength channel allocation scheme which increases the number of channels that a WDM system can support.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of claim 3 and claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice.

The amendments to claim 1 are in accordance with the agreement reached in the interview and are believed to overcome the current rejection of claim 1.

Amended claim 1 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and recites additional patentable subject matter.

Claim 2 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claim 4, which originally depended from claim 3, has been amended to depend from claim 1. Claim 4 recites additional patentable subject matter.

Claim 4 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 5 and 6 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and recite additional patentable subject matter.

Claims 5 and 6 are therefore deemed allowable.

Claim 7 is deemed allowable in accordance with the agreement reached in the interview.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7 and recites additional patentable subject matter.

Claim 8 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claim 9 is deemed allowable in view of the argument presented in the interview and in accordance with the agreement reached in the interview.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9 and recite additional patentable subject matter.

Claims 10 and 11 are therefore deemed allowable.

Claim 26 has been amended similarly to claim 1. The amendments to claim 26 are in accordance with the agreement reached in the interview and are believed to overcome the current rejection of claim 26.

Amended claim 26 is therefore deemed allowable.

5           Claim 27 is deemed allowable in accordance with the agreement reached in the interview.

Claim 28 is deemed allowable in view of the argument presented in the interview and in accordance with the agreement reached in the interview.

          Claims 34 – 38 depend from claim 1 and recite additional patentable  
10   subject matter.

Claims 34 – 38 are therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 39 and 40 depend directly or indirectly from claim 7 and recite additional patentable subject matter.

Claims 39 and 40 are therefore deemed allowable.

15           Claims 41 – 50 depend directly or indirectly from claim 26 and recite additional patentable subject matter.

Claims 41 – 50 are therefore deemed allowable.

Claim 51 is deemed allowable for the reason set forth in the interview and in accordance with the agreement reached in the interview.

20           Claim 52 depends from claim 51 and recites additional patentable subject matter.

Claim 52 is therefore deemed allowable.

          In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable  
25   reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Doron HANDELMAN

30           Date: April 9, 2006